

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11-14, 16-25, 28-36 are all the claims pending as claim 2 and 10 are cancelled.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 10, 14 and 25 and cancelled claims 2 and 10 from further consideration in this application. Applicants are not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the application. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103 under Polizzi and Lamberton

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 8, 10-14, 19, 21-25, 31 and 33-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Polizzi et al (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002|0023158; “Polizzi”), in view of Lamberton et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,779,017; “Lamberton”). Claim 1 is amended to recite the limitations of claims 2 and 10. For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit these claims are not rendered unpatentable in view of Polizzi and Lamberton.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites a method for identifying a status corresponding to interactions between a remote application and a data source, the method comprising, *inter alia*, generating a log file comprising an arbitrary set of parameters selectively established to reflect a status of a connection between the remote application and the data source desired to be monitored, and connecting directly

the interface module and the port module for communicating independently from the connection manager.

The Examiner alleges that Polizzi, in paragraph [0061], discloses “generating a log file comprising an arbitrary set of parameters selectively established to reflect a status of a connection between the remote application and the data source desired to be monitored”.

Applicants respectfully submit that Polizzi fails to teach or suggest this claimed feature as contended in the Office Action. Accordingly, even if Polizzi was modified based on Lamberton as asserted in the Office Action, all the limitations of claim 1 would not be met. In paragraph [0061] Polizzi merely discloses scheduling a job to run on a predetermined schedule by associating the job with certain properties and parameters. These properties and parameters define values to execute a job. However, Polizzi neither teaches nor suggests providing information regarding the status of any connections, much less the connection between a remote application and a data source. Polizzi, in paragraph [0061] and elsewhere also neither teaches nor suggests generating a log file comprising an arbitrary set of parameters selectively established to reflect a status of a connection between the remote application and the data source desired to be monitored. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Polizzi nor Lamberton, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests all the limitations of claim 1.

The Examiner further admits that Polizzi does not disclose “connecting directly the interface module and the port module for communicating independently from the connection manager” and relies on Lamberton for disclosing this feature.

Specifically, the Examiner alleges that the system disclosed by Lamberton, whereby a load balancer is responsible for facilitating connections between a user’s remote application and a data

source such as a server, is much like Applicants' claimed connection manager. The Examiner contends it would have been obvious for one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify Polizzi's system to incorporate Lamberton's teachings of utilizing a manager to facilitate the initial connection to a data source but bypassing the manager on subsequent communications. It is asserted that the combination would enable direct communication between Polizzi's network interface and agents independent of the service broker, freeing the service broker to provide the capability of handling more requests to the data source.

Applicants respectfully submit that it would not have been obvious, as contended in the Office Action, for one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify Polizzi's system to incorporate Lamberton's teachings. Modifying Polizzi so that the network interface communicates directly with the service agents would defeat the purpose of Polizzi's system, and would in fact cause Polizzi's system to not work as intended. According to Polizzi, the service broker performs two functions in the portal system: 1) it controls access to the portal system by users; and 2) it controls the disposition of jobs to the service agents within the portal system (Polizzi, [0024]).

Considering first the second of the two functions of Polizzi's service broker, the service agents which comprise Polizzi's portal system are not mirrors of one another. Rather, Polizzi discloses a plurality of service agents in which each of the service agents is configured to perform a **specific task**, such as, an event server, an authentication server, a name server, a job server, a repository, and a knowledge server (Polizzi, [0021]). When the service broker receives a job from the user, the service broker may contact the authentication server service agent to determine if a particular user should be granted access to the portal system, schedule it through the event server

service agent, contact the name server service agent to determine the location of a specific job server service agent, execute the job through the job server service agent, etc. (Polizzi, [0024]).

Polizzi discloses two classes of jobs. The first class of jobs is an ad-hoc job, where the job is performed at the request of a user and the output report transmitted to the user (Polizzi, [0026]). The second class of jobs is a scheduled job, where the job is performed on a predetermined basis and the output results stored in the repository service agent. Determining the type of service agents with which communication is required depends on the individual job being performed. When the user requests the output results of a scheduled job, it may be necessary to communicate with the repository service agent to retrieve the output results. When the user requests an ad-hoc job, it may not be necessary to communicate with the repository service agent. In addition, the user may subscribe to a job and receive output whenever the job server service agent performs the job. This may necessitate communication with the event server service agent which provides the subscription service (Polizzi, [0042]).

Now, returning to the first of the two functions of the service broker taught by Polizzi, as previously mentioned, Polizzi discloses that the service broker controls users' access to the portal system rather than providing users with direct access to the portal system. Polizzi does not teach or suggest that the user is to have direct access to the various service agents within the portal system. Rather, Polizzi discloses that communication with several service agents, which each perform distinct specific tasks, is necessary to complete a job and the specific service agents with which communication is required varies on the individual job. The service broker serves these functions of controlling user access to the portal system and controlling the disposition of jobs to the appropriate service agents.

It would be contrary to the teachings of Polizzi for the first request by the user to be handled through the service broker and all subsequent requests by the user sent to the same service agent bypassing the service broker, because each service broker only performs a specific task. If the network interface were to have knowledge of the various service agents and allow communication with them, then Polizzi's purpose of protecting the portal system from the user would be frustrated. Thus, removing the service broker and facilitating direct communication between the network interface and the service agents is contrary to the teachings of Polizzi.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over Polizzi in view of Lamberton.

Claims 3, 5-9, 11 and 12

Since claims 3, 5-9, 11 and 12 are dependent on claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit said claims as patentable over Polizzi in view of Lamberton at least by virtue of their dependency.

Claim 14

Claim 14 recites a computer readable medium having stored thereon computer executable instructions for performing a method for connecting a plurality of remote applications with a data source, the method comprising, *inter alia*, generating a log file comprising an arbitrary set of parameters selectively established to reflect a status of a connection between the remote application and the data source desired to be monitored, wherein the method further comprises connecting directly the interface module and the port module for communicating independently from the connection manager. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 14 is patentable for at least reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 16-24

Since claims 16-24 are dependent on claim 14, the Applicants respectfully submit said claims as patentable over Polizzi in view of Lamberton at least by virtue of their dependency.

Claim 25

Claim 25 recites a system for connecting a plurality of remote applications with a data source, the system comprising, *inter alia*, a log file comprising parameters arbitrarily selectable by a user to reflect a status of a connection between the remote application and the data source desired to be monitored by a user wherein one of the port module and the interface module is further configured to directly connect the interface module and the port module for communicating independently from the connection manager module. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 25 is patentable for at least reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 28-36

Since claims 28-36 are dependent on claim 25, the Applicants respectfully submit said claims as patentable over Polizzi in view of Lamberton at least by virtue of their dependency.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103 under Polizzi and Albert

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 8, 10-14, 19, 21-25, 31 and 33-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Polizzi et al (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002|0023158; “Polizzi”), in view of Albert et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,970,913; “Albert”). For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit these claims are not rendered unpatentable in view of Polizzi and Albert.

Claim 1

Claim 1 is amended and recites a method for identifying a status corresponding to interactions between a remote application and a data source, the method comprising, *inter alia*, generating a log file comprising an arbitrary set of parameters selectively established to reflect a status of a connection between the remote application and the data source desired to be monitored, and connecting directly the interface module and the port module for communicating independently from the connection manager.

The Examiner alleges that Polizzi, in paragraph [0061], discloses “generating a log file comprising an arbitrary set of parameters selectively established to reflect a status of a connection between the remote application and the data source desired to be monitored”.

Applicants respectfully submit that Polizzi fails to teach or suggest this claimed feature as contended in the Office Action. Accordingly, even if Polizzi was modified based on Albert as asserted in the Office Action, all the limitations of claim 1 would not be met.

The Examiner further admits that Polizzi does not disclose “connecting directly the interface module and the port module for communicating independently from the connection manager” and relies on Albert for disclosing this feature.

Specifically, the Examiner alleges the system disclosed by Albert, whereby a service manager is responsible for facilitating connections between a user’s remote application and a data source such as a server, is much like the Applicants’ claimed connection manager. The Examiner contends it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to modify Polizzi’s system to incorporate Albert’s teachings of utilizing a service manager to facilitate the initial connection to a data source but bypassing the manager on subsequent communications. It is asserted that the

combination would enable direct communications between Polizzi's network interface and agents independent of the service broker, freeing the service broker to provide the capability of handling more requests to the data source.

Applicants respectfully submit that it would not have been obvious, as contended in the Office Action, for one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify Polizzi's system to incorporate Albert's teachings. Modifying Polizzi so that the network interface communicates directly with the service agents would defeat the purpose of Polizzi's system, and would in fact cause Polizzi's system to not work as intended, as discussed above.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over Polizzi in view of Albert for reasons similar to those submitted above by the Applicants in response to the Examiner's rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Polizzi in view of Lamberton.

Claims 3, 5-9, 11 and 12

Since claims 3, 5-9, 11 and 12 are dependent on claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit said claims as patentable over Polizzi in view of Albert at least by virtue of their dependency.

Claim 14

Claim 14 recites a computer readable medium having stored thereon computer executable instructions for performing a method for connecting a plurality of remote applications with a data source, the method comprising, *inter alia*, generating a log file comprising an arbitrary set of parameters selectively established to reflect a status of a connection between the remote application and the data source desired to be monitored, wherein the method further comprises connecting directly the interface module and the port module for communicating independently from the

connection manager. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 14 is patentable for at least reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 16-24

Since claims 16-24 are dependent on claim 14, the Applicants respectfully submit said claims as patentable over Polizzi in view of Albert at least by virtue of their dependency.

Claim 25

Claim 25 recites a system for connecting a plurality of remote applications with a data source, the system comprising, *inter alia*, a log file comprising parameters arbitrarily selectable by a user to reflect a status of a connection between the remote application and the data source desired to be monitored by a user wherein one of the port module and the interface module is further configured to directly connect the interface module and the port module for communicating independently from the connection manager module. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 25 is patentable for at least reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 28-36

Since claims 28-36 are dependent on claim 25, the Applicants respectfully submit said claims as patentable over Polizzi in view of Albert at least by virtue of their dependency.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Patent Application No. 09/750,432

A8645

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/J. Warren Lytle, Jr./



J. Warren Lytle, Jr.
Registration No. 39,283

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/142133

46159

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 31, 2007